



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,925	12/02/2004	Michael Green	HP/15-22690/A/PCT	7425
324 7590 03/02/2007 CIBA SPECIALTY CHEMICALS CORPORATION PATENT DEPARTMENT 540 WHITE PLAINS RD P O BOX 2005 TARRYTOWN, NY 10591-9005			EXAMINER HARDEE, JOHN R	
			ART UNIT 1751	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/02/2007	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/516,925

Applicant(s)

GREEN ET AL.

Examiner

John R. Hardee

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 and 32-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 and 32-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>(2)</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, copolymers consisting of monomers I and II, in the reply filed on February 8, 2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the claimed homopolymers and copolymers are novel. This is not found persuasive because they are not novel, as attested by the X references in the PCT Search Report and the grounds of rejection below.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. There appears to be a typographical error in the election. Di(hydrogenated tallow)dimethyl ammonium methyl chloride is not a monomer; it is a fabric softener. Elected monomer II is drawn to a genus of acrylamides and methacrylamides. This monomer was searched and examined.

3. No claims were withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected inventions, but the claims were searched and examined only to the extent that they read on the elected invention, as this was found not to be allowable.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

4. Several of the cited references were not available to the examiner. They were crossed out on the 1449 forms. If applicant wishes to have these references considered, copies should be submitted with a new 1449. The available references were cited by the examiner on an 892 form to make copies available in the application

### ***Double Patenting***

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-30 and 32-37 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of copending Application No. 10/536,607. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the '607 claims polymers and formulations comprising same which bear a genus-species relationship with the polymers and formulations presently claimed. The specific monomers are recited in dependent claims. This reference differs from the presently claimed subject matter in that it does not recite a composition which reads on the present claims with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

Art Unit: 1751

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to make such a composition, because this reference recites compositions comprising all of the ingredients presently recited by applicants for inclusion in a surfactant composition. The person of ordinary skill in the surfactant art would expect the recited compositions to have properties similar to those compositions which are exemplified, absent a showing to the contrary.

In the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed Cir. 1990).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

7. Claims 1-30 and 32-37 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 and 18-22 of copending Application No. 10/535,799. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the '799 claims polymers and formulations comprising same which bear a genus-species relationship with the polymers and formulations presently claimed. The specific monomers are recited in dependent claims. This reference differs from the presently claimed subject matter in that it does not recite a composition which reads on the present claims with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

Art Unit: 1751

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to make such a composition, because this reference recites compositions comprising all of the ingredients presently recited by applicants for inclusion in a surfactant composition. The person of ordinary skill in the surfactant art would expect the recited compositions to have properties similar to those compositions which are exemplified, absent a showing to the contrary.

In the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed Cir. 1990).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 5 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The recitation "the nonionic monomer of component a)" lacks antecedent basis in claim 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-19, 24-30 and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 374,458 A2. See the composition at the bottom of p. 6, which comprises 1160 ppm of methylene bisacrylamide crosslinker and 353 ppm of isopropanol chain transfer agent, based on the cationic monomer. Note also the example comprising half as much crosslinker. Formulations at 0.1% are exemplified.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

14. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

15. Claims 1-30 and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 799,887 A1. The reference discloses fabric softening compositions comprising 0.01-10% by weight of a fabric softener; at least 0.001% of a thickening agent and a chelant (p. 2, lines 49+). Suitable fabric softening quats are disclosed at p. 3, lines 15+. Suitable thickeners include cationic polymers made from 5-90% acrylamide with dialkylaminoalkyl acrylate comonomers or quatted derivatives of same (p. 8, lines 10+). The polymers must be in the form of particles of less than 10 microns. Crosslinkers, including methylene bisacrylamide, may be added at up to 4 ppm based on monomer. As the polymer may have as much as 90% acrylamide content, this implies a crosslinker content of up to 450 ppm based on cationic monomer, as presently recited. Note also the disclosure of the utility of other, heavier crosslinking agents at p. 8, lines 31-33, including metal salts. As these can have a higher molecular weight than methylene bisacrylamide, equimolar amounts of these would be present at a higher ppm by weight than methylene bisacrylamide. Chain transfer agent may be added in

Art Unit: 1751

amounts which can vary widely (p. 8, lines 34+). Suitable agents include isopropanol. Suitable chelants, present at up to 0.5%, are disclosed at p. 9, lines 52+. This reference differs from the claimed subject matter in that it does not disclose a composition which reads on applicant's claims with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to make such a composition, because this reference teaches that all of the ingredients recited by applicants are suitable for inclusion in a fabric softening composition. The person of ordinary skill in the surfactant art would expect the recited compositions to have properties similar to those compositions which are exemplified, absent a showing to the contrary.

In the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed Cir. 1990). Regarding claims 9 and 16, the lower limit of crosslinker is sufficiently close to the upper limit motivated by the reference that the person of ordinary skill in the surfactant art would expect similar properties to those of the reference. Regarding claims 24 and claims depending therefrom,

16. Claims 1-19, 24-30 and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 374,458. See the 102 rejection above. Anticipation is the epitome of obviousness.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Art Unit: 1751

examiner should be directed to the examiner, Dr. John R. Hardee, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 until 4:30. In the event that the examiner is not available, his supervisor, Mr. Douglas McGinty, may be reached at (571) 272-1029.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Hardee', with a stylized, cursive script.

John R. Hardee  
Primary Examiner  
February 26, 2007